(*a*) whether Arasikere Taluk come within the purview of the Central Malaria Control Scheme ;

(*b*) the number of persons affected by malaria in Arasikere Taluk in the year 1953-54 and this year, *i.e.*, 1954-55 ;

(*c*) when D.D.T. was last sprayed in this taluk ;

(*d*) whether attempt has been made to include Arasikere Taluk under the Central Malaria Control Scheme ?

A.—**Sri T. CHANNIAH** (Minister for Public Health and Local Self-Government).—

(*a*) No.

(*b*) 26,826 in 1953-54.
28,778 in 1954-55.

(*c*) During the period 19th June 1954 to 24th June 1954 in view of the incidence of malaria in the taluk in an epidemic form.

(*d*) There is no necessity to include this taluk in the scheme on a permanent basis.

PRIVILEGES MOTION.

The Editor's Sta'ement in "Deccan Herald".

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri A. V. Narasimha Reddy has given notice of a motion under Rule 173(1) as follows :

> "To discuss the privilege of the Members of this House arising out of the action of the Hon'ble Speaker in permitting the publication of the full text of the letter in the *Deccan Herald* of today addressed to this House by the Editor, *Deccan Herald*."

Hon'ble Members will remember that on 10th March 1955 the Hon'ble Home Minister brought to the notice of the Chair a case of misreporting in the *Deccan Herald* of the 9th. On this I gave a ruling on the 12th to the effect that no action was called for. In giving that ruling, I read out extracts of a letter received from the Editor of the *Deccan Herald*. Thereafter the Editor wrote to me that the reading out of extracts was not fair to him and he wanted permission to publish the entire letter. I readily granted him the permission.

Sri Mulka Govinda Reddy also raised this matter yesterday after question hour. He wanted to know why the full statement was not read out to the House and added that the full text of the letter gives a different version from the version got from hearing only extracts.

I fail to see how any privilege of an Hon'ble Member is involved. There was on the 10th no motion before the House. There was no proposition on which the vote of the House was required. The reading of the letter or extracts therefrom could not therefore affect any opinion of the House as there was no matter before the House for recording its opinion. What was called for at that stage was a ruling of the Speaker and in giving my ruling I read out what I considered were relevant extracts from the letter. I did not consider it necessary to read the entire letter as, in my opinion, the parts I omitted were not relevant to the matter in issue. In fact when the Editor requested permission to publish the full letter I readily consented as I did not consider that there was any essential difference between the full letter and the extracts I read out so far as the matter in issue was concerned.

I must also state that this motion seeks to call in question the action of the Speaker. It is wellknown that where provison is made for making a substantive motion admitting of a distinctive vote of the House, it cannot be debated except on such a motion. The conduct of the Speaker is one such. His action cannot be Criticised incidentally in debate or upon any form of proceeding except on substantive motion.

I have therefore to rule the motion as out of order